Document 4

Filed 10/01/2007

Page 1 of 3

Case 3:07-cv-04599-MHP

On Sunday, September 30, 2007, I served via e-mail (snewman@stroock.com) a copy of the Plaintiff's Administrative Motion To Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, Pursuant To Local Rule 7-11, attorney, Stephen J. Newman, of the law firm of Stroock, Stroock & Lavan, L.L.P. (hereafter "Stroock"), who accepted service on behalf of his clients.. Mr. Newman is a partner in Stroock's Los Angeles office, located at 2029 Century Park East, Los Angeles, CA 90067-3086, (310) 556-5800. Subsequent to the filing of the Plaintiff's Administrative Motion Mr. Newman advised me by telephone that his firm would be representing Defendants Chase Manhattan Bank U.S.A., N.A., Chase Manhattan Bank U.S.A., N.A. D.B.A. Chase Bank U.S.A., N.A., JPMorgan Chase & Co., American Express Travel Related Services, Inc., American Express Centurion Bank, and American Express Bank, FSB in connection with the case numbers C 07-4765 EDL and C 07-4732 MJJ, both of which are implicated in Plaintiff's Administrative Motion To Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, Pursuant To Local Rule 7-11.

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

On Monday, October 1, 2007, I personally served the agent for service of process for Defendants Capital One Bank and Capital One Services, Inc., The Corporation Service Company, located at 11 South 12th Street, Richmond, VA 23218, with a copy of the Plaintiff's Administrative Motion To Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, Pursuant To Local Rule 7-11.

21

22

23

24 25 I declare that the foregoing is true and correct, under penalty of perjury, pursuant to 28

U.S.C. § 1746, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: October 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Plaintiffs

David J. Lee, et al. v. Capital One Bank, Inc. et al., Proof Of Service Re: Plaintiff's Administrative Motion To Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, Pursuant To Local Rule 7-11